

**Remarks/Arguments:**

This is a reply to the office action of November 15, in which the examiner indicated that claims 29 - 42 would be allowable if they were rewritten to overcome the rejections under section 112 and the objections to the claims and specification.

The examiner properly objected to claim 30 because of erroneous dependency; that claim has been amended to depend from claim 29. Also, claim 43 depends now from claim 42.

The examiner objected to the specification for failing to provide antecedent basis for “an adjuster”. We have addressed the objection by deleting the term “adjuster” from the claims: in claims 29 and 44, the relevant parts of those claims now read “means for selectively adjusting..”. The term “adjuster” has also been deleted from claim 31 and replaced by “adjusting means”. Claim 50 has been amended by substituting the term “adjustment arm” for “adjuster”. Inasmuch as the terms “means for selectively adjusting” and “adjustment arm” were present in the specification and claims as filed originally, the amended claim language is properly supported, and no change to the specification itself is deemed necessary.

With regard to the claim rejection under 35 USC §112 in item 3, the term “the support boss” in claim 29 has been amended to read “the support body” and “boss” has been amended to read “the support body”.

We believe that, with the changes made above, the specification and claims comply with section 112 of the statute, and that this application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles Fallow/

---

Charles W. Fallow  
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.  
10 Post Office Road - Suite 100  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

February 7, 2007